

yesterday he is "Eager to work with Congress" to reduce the deficit, and since his budget refused to do that by reducing the growth of Government spending, that can leave only one possible answer: Tax increases; tax increases.

Are we going to be told by the President, "Well, we have to balance the budget. This is the wrong way. The right way is to do what I did in 1993, have a big, big \$255 billion tax increase"? I have not heard any other options. We have to conclude something.

The only conclusion I can reach is the President does not want to balance the budget, does not want to cut spending, does not want to preserve, protect and improve Medicare. So it seems to me we have been waiting now 11 days since we proposed our balanced budget plan. We have not heard a word from anybody on the other side of the aisle. We have not heard a word from the President, and the deficit has increased \$4.9 billion since we submitted our balanced budget plan.

Is our plan perfect? No, but it is an honest effort to transform Government to make it smaller, to make it smarter, to make it more sensitive, to make it more responsive, to make it less expensive and to reverse the 40-year tide of power to the Federal Government.

Let me say, we look forward to next week. I guess you could say we are prepared to make the tough decisions, the President will not make any decision. That is a clear difference in party philosophy: Do not make any decisions, come to the floor and complain about what happens to senior citizens, children, veterans, farmers and everybody else, but do not worry about the next generation, do not worry about your grandchildren, do not worry about your young children. It will all be taken care of by red ink, as the Senator from Maine, Senator SNOWE, just pointed out.

It seems to me that if we want status quo policies, I guess we can have those, if the Democrats prevail. But what we need to do right now is defeat the President's budget and then have serious debate on the balanced budget proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI. It is not because it is good political theater, as some have suggested, but I think it is time to do the right thing.

I think the President, in his inaugural address, used the word "change" 11 times. Apparently he is out of change. He does not want any more change. He wants the status quo: "Do not cut farm subsidies, do not do this, do not do that, do not cut anything until after I am reelected in 1996."

I do not believe that will sell. I believe the American people are ready—they have been ready for leadership on the budget. We have had a lot of leadership on the other side over the years on the budget, and I am still hopeful we will still have leadership on the other side on the deficit.

We ought to be in this together. But this is the first step. This is the first

vote. This is a defining vote, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the President's budget.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO GREET VISITING PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the announcement of the results of this vote that the Senate stand in recess for 3 minutes in order that Members of the Senate may greet the parliamentarians who are on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:55 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to vote on amendment No. 1111. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHELBY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 99, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

NAYS—99

Abraham	Feinstein	Lugar
Akaka	Ford	Mack
Ashcroft	Frist	McCain
Baucus	Glenn	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Gramm	Moynihan
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Bradley	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatch	Packwood
Bumpers	Hatfield	Pell
Burns	Heflin	Pressler
Byrd	Helms	Pryor
Campbell	Hollings	Reid
Chafee	Hutchison	Robb
Coats	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cochran	Inouye	Roth
Cohen	Jeffords	Santorum
Conrad	Johnston	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Shelby
Craig	Kempthorne	Simon
D'Amato	Kennedy	Simpson
Daschle	Kerrey	Smith
DeWine	Kerry	Snowe
Dodd	Kohl	Specter
Dole	Kyl	Stevens
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thomas
Dorgan	Leahy	Thompson
Exon	Levin	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lieberman	Warner
Feingold	Lott	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Boxer

So the amendment (No. 1111) was rejected.

DEFENSE AND BUDGET ISSUES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes off the bill to speak on the budget issue and the defense issue.

Mr. President, next week some time, I presume it would be Senators from both sides of the aisle, but I am sure it will be led by some Senator from my side of the aisle, we will discuss the issue of increasing the Senate Budget Committee's numbers for defense.

I do not want to speak directly to that point, but I want to set the stage for my position that I think is very unwise to do that. I will want to say in connection with some of the remarks I am going to say that there is an article in the Washington Post today on the Federal page where it refers to Senator GLENN, and I agree totally with Senator GLENN.

He was holding a hearing on the bad accounting practices of the Defense Department. It refers to Senator GLENN this way:

GLENN, who held hearings this week on the subject, lamented the fact that while his colleagues worry about budgetary restraints, so few of them have been interested in the Pentagon's wasteful financial practices.

Senator GLENN spoke about the wasteful financial practices. I have spoken on that subject many times. I thank Senator GLENN for his leadership.

I want to take a few moments to express concern about a new policy that is being pushed by the comptroller at the Department of Defense, Mr. John Hamre. I think, basically, Mr. Hamre is trying to do a lot of good but he is running into a cement wall on many of the things he is trying to accomplish.

His plan undermines the case for pushing up the defense budget. Mr. Hamre is proposing just to write off—just write off—billions of dollars of unmatched disbursements. Now, unmatched disbursements are expenditures that he says he cannot link to supporting documentation, so he is really ready to throw in the towel and to write them off the books.

The Armed Services Committee held hearings, and I refer to Senator GLENN on this and related matters. The defense appropriations subcommittee is going to hold similar hearings next Tuesday.

Not being a member of either committee, I am unable to participate in those discussions.

But because of my intense interest in the subject, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, my good friend Senator TED STEVENS, invited me to submit a statement for the record.

So, I would now like to share my thoughts on this issue with my colleagues.

I think the issue has a direct bearing on the proposal to pump up the defense budget, which will be an issue next week, I think.

I am deeply troubled by Mr. Hamre's proposal.